

FILED

11 AUG 24 AM 9:08

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BY:

DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PABLO AGRIO,

Petitioner,

vs.

JOHN MARSHALL, Warden, et al.,

Respondents.

CASE NO. 09cv2712-WMc

ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE
OF APPEALABILITY

On July 13, 2011, this Court entered judgment denying petitioner's writ of habeas corpus. [Doc. No. 16.] After reviewing the record, the Court finds good cause to deny a certificate of appealability.

Rule 11 of the Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases states, "[t]he district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant." A certificate of appealability should be issued only where the petition presents "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To meet this threshold showing, Petitioner must show: (1) the issues are debatable among jurists of reason, (2) a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or (3) the questions are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further. *Lambright v. Stewart*, 220 F.3d 1022, 1024-25 (9th Cir. 2000) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473 (2000); *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880 (1983)).

Here, the Court finds the issues are not debatable among jurists of reason, nor could the issues be resolved in a different manner. The Supreme Court's holding in *Swarthout v. Cooke*, 131 S. Ct. 859 (2011) places Agrio's claims beyond reasonable debate or alternative resolution because

1 Agrio raised only substantive, as opposed to procedural, challenges to his parole hearing. Likewise,
2 the questions presented here do not deserve encouragement to proceed further. Accordingly, the
3 Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Date: August 23, 2011

6
7 

8 Hon. William McCurine, Jr.
9 U.S. Magistrate Judge
10 United States District Court
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28